

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

VOL. XIII, No. 10

JUNE 8, 1953

\$2.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

The Danger in Our Intransigence

THE arguments between the British and some of our Senators have revealed in a startling way the American tendency to become isolated from the thinking and the feeling, from the hopes and the fears of the rest of the world. Even Canada has come to share the common misgivings about our policy.

The behaviour of Senator McCarthy has probably been discussed often enough in this journal but it is desirable to call attention to the extent to which he and the way in which the administration continues to defer to him scandalize all our friends abroad. These episodes connected with McCarthy quite naturally cause them to distrust our judgment as a nation. Mr. Attlee's question as to whether Senator McCarthy or the President is running our government may have been indiscreet but it was a very natural question in view of what is happening here. Incidentally, the full text of Attlee's speech which has been published by *The New York Times* shows that it was a very moderate speech indeed and that it did little more than echo what many American social scientists have said about the difficulty of securing responsible party government under our system. Fortunately two Republican Senators (Senators Wiley and Alexander Smith) repudiated McCarthy's violent outburst against the British. This journal praised the administration for its resistance to McCarthy in connection with the Bohlen appointment but since then the record has been one of continual surrender. The refusal of the administration to defend the appointment of Mrs. Douglas Horton is generally regarded as so absurd that the reaction to it may force a change. At present a small, extremist and spiteful minority is allowed by the administration to have a veto over the appointment of citizens who stand high in the country's esteem. All of these events together with the equally fantastic immigration policies to which the McCarran act has led cause many people in other countries to wonder if the freedom about which we talk so much is really worth defending against totalitarianism. It is ironical that so much that is done by those who hate Communism here is well calculated to confuse the struggle against Communism abroad.

We are now seeing more clearly than ever another tendency which quite naturally causes distrust abroad—a tendency toward intransigence in policy. This is in part a result of McCarthy's intimidation of the administration. The President in his foreign policy speech on April 16th gave new hope to the world. But nothing that has happened since confirms that hope. We can blame the Russians and their allies for this in part but only in part. Important also is the very widespread assumption in this country that we can deal with the foe in Korea as though we were in a position to dictate the terms of peace. We are right in our determination to protect prisoners of war who refuse to return to their countries from intimidation by the Communists and from an indefinite period of detention. But we have created an atmosphere in which to our friends we seem only a little less unreasonable than the Communists. Pressure from the Indians, the Canadians, and the British may bring about a change but why is the situation allowed to reach such a pass? We do know that there are people in high places in this country who do not want a truce unless it is based upon military victory. Can we be sure that no such persons are in a position to sabotage negotiations?

There seems to be a technical reason for leaving these negotiations in the hands of the military but the deeper issues at stake are issues on which the military have no monopoly of wisdom and, when we consider the alternatives to a truce, more than the wisdom of military minds is especially needed. It is not reassuring that the new head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radburn, is known to believe that our country will never be secure until Communist China is defeated and that this would apply even to a Titoist China. Such a combination of strategic and ideological thinking could tempt us to very wild military adventures.

Those who speak lightly about using atomic bombs in Korea in case a truce is not brought about need to reflect more on the moral reverberations of such a decision. For one thing, it would prove to all of Asia that we use atomic bombs only on colored people. That is already strongly suspected. Also to much of the world the use of atomic bombs would

seem as great a moral atrocity as any of the crimes which we hold against the Communists. That may be unfair but it is a hard argument to answer. By using atomic bombs we might win a local victory and at the same time consolidate the whole of Asia against us.

Our intransigence as a nation is also to be seen in the way in which we approach the problems of the political settlement that is expected to follow a truce. James Reston in *The New York Times* analyzes the predicament of the President as he goes to Bermuda to confer with the leaders of Britain and France. He shows that a major difficulty is that in the President's own party there is a very powerful bloc that is unwilling to make any concessions whatever to the Russians and the Chinese. The most controversial issue is the admission of Communist China to the U.N. Given an end of the Korean fighting the whole world seems to favor this with the exception of one group in our own country which happens to be strongest in the Republican Party. Senator Knowland has proposed that we leave the U.N. if China is admitted. This setting up

of ourselves as the sole judge of what is right is the worst feature of this attitude.

We must surely protect Formosa against the Communists but we cannot refuse to make any concessions. The admission of Communist China is essential in the long run if the U.N. is to include the governments whose policies are of decisive importance to the world as a whole. Admission to the U.N. does not mean approval of the government admitted.

The President's calling of the Bermuda conference is an indication that he does not want us to go our own way in indifference to the feelings and convictions of other nations in the free world. It is to be hoped that moderate opinion in this country will be mobilized to support him if he seeks to find a way in which to cooperate with our friends and to "co-exist" with the nations to which we are deeply opposed. What will come in the longer future we cannot predict but this is the immediate goal which most Americans prefer either to a continuation of fighting in Korea or to an all-out war in Asia.

J. C. B.

The Recent Church Peace Mission Report

EDWARD LEROY LONG, JR.

ON May 11th, a group of theologians working under the auspices of the Church Peace Mission issued a report on their thinking regarding the relation of the Christian conscience to modern war. The document*, several months in preparation, was prompted by widespread dissatisfaction (mostly on the part of pacifist thinkers) with certain features of the Dun Commission Report on *The Christian Conscience and Weapons of Mass Destruction* which was issued in 1950. The recent report also expresses a more particular concern, shared by many, over the lack of adequate and serious presentation of the pacifist case in the contemporary church. In the words of the report there is this summary of the situation:

"... between pacifists and nonpacifists no genuine and continuous conversation and exchange of ideas has taken place for some years. The ten-

dency has been to assume that all the arguments regarding participation in war have been stated, and that some Christians have been led to one position, some to another, and there is nothing more to be done. But as we maintain our traditional stands, war grows 'untraditional' by leaps and bounds. The special character of modern war poses with new and terrible urgency the problem of overcoming it.

We have, therefore, made an earnest effort to take a fresh look at the situation in which we find ourselves as Christians and at the problems with which we are faced." (p. 5.)

The new report begins by reviewing the points on which sensitive Christian nonpacifists and Christian pacifists are agreed. It takes these points from the statement of the Dun Commission, acknowledging its agreement with what that document said about indiscriminate violence, about the doubtful possibility that a war can be "just" under modern conditions, and about the tendencies of modern war to become suicidal and to defy all moral bounds. It rejoices in the agreement between pacifists and nonpacifists that doctrines of preventive and inevitable war are to be steadfastly rejected by Christians and that for

* The Christian Conscience and War. *The Statement of a Commission of Theologians and Religious Leaders appointed by the Church Peace Mission. Copies available at \$.25 each (discount in quantity) from Church Peace Mission, 513 West 166th Street, New York 32, N. Y.*

Christians military considerations alone can never dictate the direction of policy. It hails as perhaps the most basic understanding of all the recognition on the part of both pacifists and nonpacifists that war always involves sin, even when considered as a necessary moral compromise.

"Such a witness of sensitive and concerned Christian nonpacifists in their agony over the cost of war (not simply to themselves, but to God's world as a whole) is as removed in intent and ethical meaning from a war ethic of self-defense as is a Christian pacifist position." (p. 8.)

This distinction between sensitive Christian nonpacifism and a jingoistic patriotism is an important point in the new statement. Conscientious participation, which acknowledges the moral problems of participation in war and makes its decision to fight in agony of soul is more closely akin to conscientious objection to war than it is to a willy-nilly participation which raises no ethical questions and serves the state in abandoned devotion to purely nationalistic ends. This distinction implies that the crucial thing to the Christian faith is not the decision to fight or not to fight, but rather the dimension of spiritual sensitivity and insight exercised in making the decision either way. By implying this, the report tends to put pacifism into the category of proximate ethical decision rather than of ultimate religious judgment. It also paves the way for a toleration of two groups within the church, both of which may contribute in larger measure to a united voice. This basis of toleration is sounder than the dual standard implied in the Dun Commission's treatment of vocational pacifism as a pure allegiance to the ideal of love possible to a few, but not to the "responsible" majority.

In fact, the regarding of vocational pacifism as "the clearest and least ambiguous alternative" is sharply qualified. In agreeing that war always involves sin, the report goes on to acknowledge that so do the actual decisions of a pacifist in time of war.

"Even if pacifism is 'the least ambiguous alternative' open to the contemporary Christian, it also confronts him with the need of making tragic choices. These ambiguities are apparent whenever pacifism seeks political expression. Certain strategies of non-violence may cloak a contradiction of love as serious as strategies that involve resort to violence. All men stand in need of the redeeming love of God. The Lord of love, who is the Prince of Peace, no doubt judges most severely, whether in pacifist or nonpacifist, the unagonized choice, the complacent conscience, the sinner who justifies himself and condemns his brother, instead of invoking upon both the divine mercy which neither merits." (p. 9.)

This surely passes beyond the "liberal"-neo-ortho-

dox" wrangle that has not infrequently been evident in pacifist-nonpacifist discussions. As the report suggests, the acknowledgment of compromise can never be the insight of just one side, nor should it be used as the private polemical tool of the nonpacifist. There is a nonperfectionistic pacifism; this report has attempted to state its case.

Turning to the points of difference between the two groups, the report summarizes its remarks under four headings. Under the first, "Justice, Law, Coercive Power, War" it suggests that it is impossible to draw a straight line from the need for coercive power as exercised in community relationships to the justification of wholesale war. It also holds it false to regard justice as primarily a matter of force. "Justice is not simply the slags that boils off the cauldron of the power struggle. It is a creative and hard-won achievement of men who seek to organize their common life for meaning and stability." (p. 10.) With this all can agree, even though they do not take it to imply that appeals to justice are altogether ruled out as defense for modern war under particular conditions. The second heading accuses some nonpacifists of misusing the doctrine of the lesser evil by justifying war without due consideration of the possibility that in specific cases war might be the greater evil. Especially is this a possible case in the matter of a future atomic war. The third heading, "Tyranny and War" suggests that far from being mutually exclusive categories these two often go together. "The choice for tyranny makes for war, and the choice of war to end tyranny makes for greater tyranny—and the next war." (p. 13.)

These are the kind of pacifist judgments which are not persuasive to the nonpacifist. They are continuing points of honest disagreement as to how history operates. Perhaps there is no way of transcending the ideological differences which are implicit in arguments advanced by both sides. No side avoids an arbitrariness which colors its sociological analysis. Pacifism looks realistic to pacifists and foolish to nonpacifists, and vice versa.

The fourth heading under the discussion of disagreements deserves special treatment by itself. It is apt to become the most controversial aspect of the document and reflects one of the most fundamental differences between the outlook of this report and that of the Dun Commission. This new report holds that Christians make a fundamental error when they assume a primary loyalty to their nation-state and proceed to adjust their Christian strategy to this condition. This splits the church of Christ asunder, but leaves the nation-states intact. Perhaps this criticism ought to be leveled only against the jingoistic type of nonpacifism which marks the majority of the church, but even the most sophisticated theological discussion can be caught

assuming the preservation of particular nation-states as the only channels by which these matters can be effectively handled.

The next large section of the report entitled "Our Resources" moves into a more theoretical discussion of the relationship of Christian love to historical decision. In this section there is an assertion of the ultimacy of love, but it is not conceived in perfectionistic or simple terms. The argument here maintains, and in this all Christians ought to agree, that love is the only norm for Christian action. "We ought to be able to appeal to the norm even in justification of actions that seem to contradict it. Even when in the ambiguities of historical decisions we choose what we regard as lesser evils, we should weigh the alternatives against the norm of love and not some other standard." (p. 122, ff.) Furthermore, the report says, "Love can sometimes prove more practical and expedient than the calculations of expediency. The principle of love may be to the culture as a parent is to the child, a wisdom not immediately understood but finally valid." (p. 24.) This is, in reality, the answer which this report would give concerning the impasse between the sociological analysis of the pacifist vs. the nonpacifist. It would make a leap of faith in the absence of any strictly objective analysis that its position is in the long run the realistic and Christian one.

The conclusions of the report, forming part three, are irenic in tone, and should furnish a real basis for discussion. The first conclusion is a call for a more united voice on these matters in the church, a voice to be arrived at by renewed discussion on all levels—on the parish level, in denominational groups, by the ecumenical movement. This call is extended with openness of mind, but with no lack of conviction regarding its own outlook. Many of us hope that the document just published will serve to rekindle a meaningful and dedicated discussion of the problems of the Christian conscience as it faces the ever-increasing fury of modern absolutized war. It will be too bad if the statement is dismissed out of hand as a rehash of the traditional arguments for non-participation in war. Indeed one might say not only too bad, but grossly unfair to a statement which had made an effort to rethink the problem and frankly calls for a new level of discussion to take place in the church at large. If this report can do nothing more than to fill in a gap it will be worthwhile. The pacifist case had long needed a careful and consistent restatement, a restatement demonstrating its capacity to purify itself of the aberrations often attached to it and also prevent ridicule and oversimplification by its critiques.

The second part of the conclusions calls for a break with war. This section deserves careful study, for it will be most open to caricature and misunder-

standing. It speaks of a break with "modern absolutized war." This itself is an important point which might well leave room for some forms of collective security and cold war tactics. The report is worth quoting at length from this section.

"... there is well nigh universal agreement that vocational pacifism and vocational pacifists have a place in the Church. Our question is whether the time has not arrived when the Church and its members generally should follow this vocation, in order that the Church should be to the culture what the pacifist is to the Church.

"Even sensitive nonpacifists have indicated the need for restraint over the power struggle, and asserted that every effort should be made to "keep the cold war cold" in order that we can "buy time" to negotiate political issues between present blocs of power and to develop machinery for maintaining peace. They have further suggested that the Church cannot acquiesce in a war conducted by the norm of sheer military expedience, and that all doctrines of preventive and inevitable war must resolutely be rejected.

"If we agree as Christians on these points, then we have ample room for decided and concerted witness. Such a witness must be more than verbalization by theologians in little understood and hardly publicized documents. It must be a radical witness that reaches the general run of church members, and marshals their concern and effort against all the secular forces driving us toward the use of war as a solution to our current problems.

"Our nation is not tempted to destroy its power. Even political isolationism now advocates strong armament, and in its new versions generally argues for the single-handed use of great American power without regard for the will of the community of nations as expressed in the United Nations. Little responsibility devolves even on sensitive nonpacifists to urge military preparation. But tremendous responsibility falls on all Christians to qualify such preparation."

The general approach for which this passage calls would constantly and decidedly witness to the abnormality of the evil of war and qualify every military enterprise with even a hyper-sensitivity to its possible excess. There is little hope for the success of any policy that does not bring power under scrutiny and judgment. The scrutiny and judgment must transcend merely prudential considerations and practical politics. A church which says this, while not pacifist in any doctrinaire sense, will certainly be far more at variance with the main stream of culture than is the church-as-a-whole today. It might even

be that this ethical judgment, more vocational than practical in character, should prove the practical influence that keeps our culture from plunging headlong into chaos.

This is, of course, essentially what the Dun Commission has said. What then is the distinction between this new report and the older one? This new report says this with a set of pacifist convictions and is willing explicitly to draw the line at the point of participation in modern mass weapon warfare. The Dun Report said it with a set of nonpacifist convictions, fearful that any real insistence that such a line be drawn would tie the hands of statesmen in the international power situation. The Dun Report proceeds as a conservative recognized church body might proceed, sensitive to its responsibility to culture. This new report proceeds on a more sectarian basis, fearful that the church is too easily identified with culture when it accepts "responsibility" to culture as its primary category. What now needs to be considered by all concerned with these matters is whether this is not a significant unity on a practical level. Perhaps both approaches are necessary to keep the church from too closely identifying itself with culture on the one hand, or too radically separating from culture on the other. If one accepts this, then indeed he must acknowledge the practical as well as the vocational role of pacifism and may welcome its resurgence in the church as a balancing force in the total witness of the body of Christ.

It is this set of pacifist convictions that will be the most controversial aspect of the new report. The ideological anti-pacifism of most of the culture will be prone to violent reaction against it. A culture which divides "sheep" and "goats" by patriotic criteria largely measured in terms of willing participation in military enterprises is not likely to be sympathetic to the assumptions of this report. Surely we ought to be able to hope for a more appreciative response from the body of Christian believers, a response which is more than just a placid willingness to tolerate the iconoclasts.

The sponsors of this report, though largely of pacifist persuasion, have many differences between themselves on some of these matters. In an eclectic document these are submerged in favor of a statement acceptable to the group. It would be false to take the document as a statement of what each of its signers would regard as the full treatment of his convictions, just as it would be false to take the Dun report in this manner. To me the most important features of this report are what may be called "theological" rather than "ethical." They are the features which bring pacifism into a Christian context, purging it of the "Gandhism" and other pluralistic outlooks that are so often mixed up with it. Also, the report is significant in that it gives pacifism a doc-

trine of sin and grace. These are the very features least likely to seep down to the popular level but which are extremely important to Christian theology. It is because these are so well stated in this report, and because they so desperately need saying in order to clarify discussion between pacifists and nonpacifists, that I believe the report to be an important document.

The report might have left more room open on certain political questions. The tendency of the report is to regard Korea as a simple case of warfare, but there may be grounds for interpreting the type of thing happening in Korea as something neither exactly peace nor absolutized war. Korea has lacked a normal military goal like the goal of forcing an enemy to unconditional surrender; it has lacked the "all-out" character of unrestrained war; it has been a localized phenomenon. All these elements have been what have made it hard to accept on the part of a nation which thinks in terms of conventional patterns of war. Perhaps they are the very elements which mark it as international police action in an embryonic sense. While police action on the international scale ought to look forward to a time when, like police action in a single nation, it proceeds against individuals and small groups we are by no means at that stage yet. The restrained type of action which has marked Korea needs a fresh analysis from the standpoint of the Christian ethic; it might be a significantly new type of compromise between the strategy of pure force and the strategy of a modified pacifism.

Even if the possible settlement of the Korean situation results in a tendency on the part of this nation to cut defense spending, it will still be true that the most necessary witness in our time is a challenge against the pretensions of force and a call for its careful restraint. A cut in defense spending for purely selfish reasons, like the "hands off" policy of the old style isolationism, is not pacifism but default militarism. It would not be an attempt to meet the whole complex of political reality with outpouring concern, but rather an effort to squeeze by without meeting it at all. The very end of the new report calls for outpouring concern on the part of all members of the ecumenical church to extend to all the world the spiritual and material ministry of Christ. With this all Christians can agree, and they can agree that such a ministry is crucially necessary beyond any ministry that nation-states can make even on the economic level. Again, the concerned and sensitive nonpacifists may, from different perspectives but a commonly understood concept of Christian concern, find company with pacifists in resisting an all inclusive concern with purely nationalistic and neo-isolationist policies supported by the general culture.

But these and similar considerations call for honest and serious study, a study which ought to be undertaken by the church at large, by a group of thinkers representative of all points of view. It is a study which ought to be undertaken in deliberate seriousness and not in an attempt to get an immediate pronouncement about a pressing public issue.

God and Man's Wrath

"Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee . . ." (Psalm 76:10)

GERALD KENNEDY

FROM February 17th to March 15th I was in Germany and France conducting five preaching missions for the United States Air Force (USAF). In the midst of many dark possibilities, a few shining places appeared. It has come to me that we are so full of gloom that we have failed to have eyes for any brightness. Is it not as bad to be unrealistically pessimistic as it is to be sentimentally optimistic? Can it be that God is using this time of troubles as a means of fulfilling His will? Or as the Seventy-Sixth Psalm says, does God still use the wrath of man to praise Him? At any rate, four things struck my mind as worthy of our consideration. The first is the tremendous advance being made in the direction of

ECUMENICITY

Any local minister knows how certain of his brethren refuse to attend the ministerial association meetings or participate in any interchurch enterprise. It is not so in our military establishments. Among the chaplains who impressed me as outstanding are a Nazarene, a Disciple, a Missouri Synod Lutheran, a Presbyterian, a Southern Baptist, a Methodist, and a Catholic. United in a common religious program, all of them differ theologically but agree in their common service. All of these men discover new areas of agreement and learn more from one another than they did in their civilian ministries.

I would not want to minimize the significance of the World or the National Council of Churches. But so far as America is concerned, Christian unity is being achieved ten times faster in the Air Force than it is through the local councils of churches. It could be that our divisions will be healed by the draft, rather than by conferences.

I do not think that this influence will be a passing one. The boy who goes home to the denominational strife of some of our over-churched towns, will not forget the time when every minister was simply "Chaplain," and the man who spoke the word he needed to hear was from another denomination. Ministers, who have shared chapels and ideas,

Haste has little place in this matter, but genuine care and long prayerful consideration have an indispensable place. The report of this new commission makes a genuine and urgent call for this kind of study and discussion on all levels of church life. It is a call that has long been needed; it is a call which ought not to go unheeded.

will not go back to the narrow definitions of the church which made fellowship impossible. If this crisis lasts a long time, as it appears quite likely it will, then the millions of young men who have had from two to four years in the ecumenical church will mean the end of isolationism in Christianity and the beginning of a new day for the American Church.

In the second place, our military forces have established

BROTHERHOOD

I had Negroes and orientals in my congregations, because they live together in the barracks. On several occasions I raised the question with officers and men, and found not one single objection. On the contrary, the officers agreed that it works and that whenever an attempt is made to separate races, it does not work. I shall not forget having dinner one night with a young major from Alabama, and we began to talk about discrimination. He told me that he had been brought up in an environment which not only assumed that society could not operate without the barriers carefully maintained but assumed that segregation was God's will. He said, "I was sure mixing us up would not work. But it does, and after being a part of it in the Air Force I know that it must happen back home and everywhere."

Is it too much to say that the wrath of man has been used to praise human brotherhood? Is it too much to say that the Church has limped along talking much and doing little in actually establishing inter-racial churches? Of course what is happening on military bases would be impossible if it had not been for the teaching and witness of the church. But the actual legal step which makes it operate came from the tragic necessity most of us regard as totally evil. May the necessity end soon! But let us not overlook in the meantime, how much our democracy has been pushed toward its true destiny by the wrath of a relentless foe which must be contained.

A third thing that impressed me very much, is the number of Americans who are having

WORLD EXPERIENCE

This is a new day and if any man doubts it, let him meet the men of the Air Force. It began with me when I talked to the pilot of the MATS plane which took me to Germany from Washington, D.C. He had taken off from Moffatt Field in California. In a few weeks, he would be flying a regular run to the Orient. It does something to men when they have one meal in Palo Alto, another in Washington, the next one in the Azores, and another one in Paris or Frankfurt. These fliers of ours are world citizens, and they speak of Arabia as casually as a previous generation spoke of the town ten miles over the hill. They know something of what is going on around the world. Newspaper reports have to be accurate when these boys are the readers. Whenever I could sit with three or four of these fellows, I learned about more places in an hour than by spending a half day in the library.

This is not true of our fliers only. When I was in school, it seemed like an impossible dream to think of a trip to Europe. It cost too much and there was no opportunity in sight. When finally I managed to scrape together enough money for a bicycle trip through Europe on my graduation from Seminary, it put me in a special category and I felt that a most unusual thing had been accomplished. But think of the boys in this generation who are stationed for a year or more throughout the world. Some of them are not using the experience for any profit to themselves, but many of them are finding a wonderful educational opportunity.

The Church should help its young men prepare themselves to exploit their period of military service. I am not trying to say it is always pleasant. Quite the contrary! It is often lonely, and if proper housing has not been provided it is miserable and full of despair. In sheer desperation some of these boys are going off the deep end, and the chief blame falls upon a nation which makes them live in an environment which discourages decency and encourages vice. But more than one boy living in Germany or France is finding cultural experiences which will be forever significant. Best of all, there is the opportunity to learn about people who share with us the common fate. My guess is that the days ahead will reveal to many an American, that his military service was a valuable part of his education. At least our young men should be prepared to find it so.

The fourth thing which impressed me, was a growing appreciation of the importance of

PERSONAL RELATIONS

This came to me first when talking with General Norstad in his office at the NATO headquarters in Fountainbleu, France. He gave me more time than

I had any right to claim, perhaps because he is the son of a Lutheran minister and has a profound respect for ministers. In our conversation he compared his job with mine, because both of them deal with personal relations. He said that the implements of warfare would be provided and he was not concerned primarily with our ability in that field. But he insisted that the real problem now is establishing confidence between our allies and ourselves. It is a matter of learning how to work together with tolerance toward one another's strange ways.

The General was not an isolated instance. The officers with whom I talked emphasized the same point and they seemed to have a sense of their personal responsibilities in this field. They are the Americans who are creating the impressions and attitudes which will determine our working relations with our allies. That there are exceptions, I have no doubt, but in general, we can be proud of the officers who are America's personal representatives.

I rode home with General Hicks one noon. As we went through the outlying villages around Chateauroux, the French youngsters, seeing the stars on his license plates, lined up and saluted enthusiastically. The General returned every salute, though his arm must have grown weary. This may seem a minor matter, but it symbolizes something very important. Americans are learning the importance of making friends and creating respect. This generation's wrath is being used by God, and this should remind us that it is still His world and the nation's future and man's destiny are still in His hands.

NEWS AND NOTES

Theologian Flies To South Africa To Beat 'Deadline'

Johannesburg (RNS)—Dr. Zachariah Koedirelang Matthews, South African Negro theologian and educator, and his wife flew back here from the U. S. to beat a "deadline" imposed by the government.

The "deadline" was set when the government refused to renew the Matthews' passports. Criticism of Prime Minister Daniel F. Malan's racial policies had been voiced in the U. S. by the Protestant churchman during his year as visiting professor at Union Theological Seminary in New York.

Last January, Dr. Matthews told the annual meeting of The Methodist Church's Foreign Missions Board that the South African election which returned the Malan government to power was a victory for the "forces of reaction." He predicted that South Africa's voteless non-white majority eventually would win freedom because "no people will be satisfied to remain in bondage forever."

Dr. Matthews, 51, was the first native to receive a bachelor of arts degree from the University of South Africa and was the first to become headmaster of a high school in this country. He later won a Phelps-

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR and JOHN C. BENNETT
Co-Chairmen

M. SEARLE BATES LISTON POPE
F. ERNEST JOHNSON HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
AMOS N. WILDER

MARION HAUSNER, Secretary

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES C. BAKER HENRY SMITH LEIPER
HENRY SLOANE COFFIN JOHN A. MACKAY
CHARLES W. GILKEY FRANCIS P. MILLER
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH EDWARD L. PARSONS
UMPHREY LEE

Stokes Fund scholarship and with it obtained a master's degree in anthropology at Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

After two years of further study in England at the London School of Economics, he returned here in 1936 to teach at the University College of Fort Hare where he subsequently became head of the Department of African Studies.

Dibelius Barred From East Germany

Berlin (RNS)—East German authorities have rejected the request of Bishop Otto Dibelius of Berlin, head of the Evangelical Church in Germany, for a permit to travel to Rathenow, near Brandenburg, in the Soviet Zone, to address a Church meeting.

Church spokesmen said it was the first time the Protestant leader had been refused permission to travel in the Soviet Zone although similar requests from other high churchmen occasionally had been turned down in the past.

Detroit Public Library
Book Receiving
5201 Woodward Ave.
Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-54

Meanwhile, the Konsistorium of the Evangelical Church of Berlin-Brandenburg asked East German Prosecutor General Ernst Melzheimer to reopen the libel action, as co-complainant with Bishop Dibelius, filed early in May against the Communist youth organization's official paper, *Junge Welt*.

In the suit, the plaintiffs had charged that *Junge Welt's* "continued slanderous attacks" on the Church and, in particular, its youth organization, *Junge Gemeinde*, "violate the laws and Constitution of the East German Republic."

The Konsistorium's request was made in reply to a notification by Herr Melzheimer that the suit was rejected because the *Junge Gemeinde* is "not a registered organization" in the Soviet Zone and, "therefore, illegal."

"Nobody can be made to believe that in East Germany an illegal organization could have worked publicly for several years," the Konsistorium said in its reply.

"The Evangelical Church maintains no youth organization in the Soviet Zone, but gathers its young parishioners on the parish level. This was agreed upon in 1946 by Col. Tulpanow, then representative of the Soviet Occupation Power, and Dr. Dibelius.

"Long before then, however, this youth work had become known as the *Junge Gemeinde*, which is a part of the Church. The Church is no organization but a Godly foundation and holds the legal status of a statutory corporation. As an integral part of this corporation, the *Junge Gemeinde* can never be an illegal organization."

Correspondence

Dear Sirs:

May I express my deep appreciation of F. E. J.'s editorial article "Communists in the Pulpit?" in the May 11th issue of *Christianity and Crisis*. It seems to me to place the problem in a clear and realistic manner, and what is perhaps even more important, to define an attitude that confronts the church squarely with its responsibility in the present difficult situation. After all the irresponsible nonsense that has been said on this subject lately, Mr. Johnson's statement comes as a refreshing reminder that the church cannot be neutral in the fight against communist totalitarianism and its "fifth column" operating in this country. Justified protest against demagoguery and against improper methods sometimes employed should never make us lose sight of this crucial fact.

Mr. Johnson's excellent statement deserves our heartiest thanks.

Will Herberg,
New York, New York

Authors In This Issue

Edward LeRoy Long, Jr., is minister-to-students at the Blacksburg Presbyterian Church in Blacksburg, Virginia, and Associate Professor of Philosophy and Ethics at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

Bishop Gerald Kennedy was on a special preaching mission for the United States Air Force in France and Germany in February and March of this year.